

DATE: NOVEMBER 29, 2018

TIME: 11:00 AM

**MEETING
ORGANIZER:**

Nicole DiStasio

PRESENT:

State representatives: Jennifer Perkins; Bard Hill; Jackie Rogers

Provider Representatives: William Ashe; Jennifer Stratton

Recipient Representatives: Beth Masters

Non-Member Participants: Cath Burns; Lynne Cleveland Vitzthum

Meeting minutes by Bard Hill, 11.29.18

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND FOLLOW UPS

Minutes:

Meeting attendees introduced themselves.

ICAP OVERVIEW AND DISCUSSION

Minutes:

The group concluded that ICAP is not a viable or effective assessment for Vermont purposes. ICAP was described as focusing on deficits rather than supports.

SIS-A FEEDBACK FROM THE WEBINAR

Minutes:

The group recommended that we continue to examine the SIS as an assessment for possible use in Vermont. Elements of the conversation:

Will the financial model and funding/payment be drive by the SIS assessment? It will be helpful, strengthened to necessary, to understand the use of the SIS in an eligibility/funding/service planning workflow before proceeding much further in this group. The SIS could be used in combination with other information including supplemental questions. General recognition that the SIS offers greater validity/reliability/consistency in

assessing specific support needs in a specific way, but additional information would be required for both funding and service planning. Recommendation that this group combine with the funding model group to address the content and use of assessment information in a process/workflow.

BEHAVIORAL/MEDICAL QUESTIONS REVIEW

Minutes:

Concern that implementing the SIS assessment will have costs (instrument and staff time) that will not be budget neutral.

What other states have used SIS and what can we learn from them? Some familiarity in the room with one state: RI. In that state the direct relationship between acuity/intensity of functional need and level of funding was said to have led to inadequate funding of employment supports for people with low functional needs.

Jennifer and Beth have both begun work on items/topics/questions that may not be adequately addressed in the SIS, and are candidates for supplemental questions in VT. One concern was how diagnoses and medical conditions are addressed in the SIS. Jennifer will pursue supplemental questions from Oregon.

Summary of decisions/recommendations and next steps:

1. ICAP is 'off the table'.
2. Continue to focus on how SIS could be used, along with other information eg supplemental questions. This could include elements of the current VT needs assessment.
3. *The group will look at (a) the need for supplemental information by issue/topic area, including suggestions from various group members, as well as (b) supplemental questions from other states. Jennifer and Beth have begun work on this.

Notes: (1) Supplemental questions from Oregon were distributed to this group later in the day on 11/29; (2) In a webinar held by HSRI on 11/29 regarding how the SIS and other information can be used to determine individual funding, HSRI mentioned HI and ID as two states that have developed supplemental questions that may be of interest to VT; (3) DAIL/DVHA staff recommended that HSRI convene a second longer and more inclusive webinar on how the SIS and other information can serve a funding purpose, to include members of this assessment workgroup.

-
4. To move forward we should understand how the SIS and any other assessment information will be used in an eligibility/funding/service authorization workflow.
 5. * The group will craft a recommendation to the broader group regarding next steps on assessment and related process/workflow at the next meeting.

* Agenda topics for next meeting (12/11)

OPEN COMMENTS SECTION

Minutes:

Two 'political' issues were identified, that we can/will address:

1. People don't want to be 'reduced to a number' by a funding/payment model or assessment.

(Note: this might be addressed by further clarification of the eligibility/funding/service planning workflow.)

2. Given that payment reform is expected to be 'budget neutral', new assessment costs cannot be absorbed by reductions in service funding/budgets.

(Note: this might be addressed by a specific budget request for these costs, based on future cost estimates.)

OUR NEXT MEETING'S DATE: **TUESDAY, DECEMBER 11TH 11-1230PM**

Draft agenda items:

1. Look at (a) the need for supplemental information by issue/topic area, including suggestions from various group members, as well as (b) supplemental questions from other states (Oregon; may include HI and ID).
2. Craft a recommendation to the broader group regarding next steps on assessment and related process/workflow. This may include a recommendation that the assessment group and the payment models group combine.
3. Public comments.